EXECUTIVE SUMMARY - ENFORCEMENT MATTER

DOCKET NO.: 2008-1825-PST-E

ET NO.: 2008-1825-PST-E TCEQ ID: RN101872265 CASE NO.: 36849 RESPONDENT NAME: SINDLO, INC. DBA RUBYS FOOD STORE

ORDER TYPE:		T.
1660 AGREED ORDER	FINDINGS AGREED ORDER	FINDINGS ORDER FOLLOWING SOAH HEARING
X FINDINGS DEFAULT ORDER	SHUTDOWN ORDER	IMMINENT AND SUBSTANTIAL ENDANGERMENT ORDER
_AMENDED ORDER	EMERGENCY ORDER	
CASE TYPE:		
AIR	MULTI-MEDIA (check all that apply)	INDUSTRIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE
PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY	X PETROLEUM STORAGE TANKS	OCCUPATIONAL CERTIFICATION
WATER QUALITY	SEWAGE SLUDGE	UNDERGROUND INJECTION CONTROL
MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE	RADIOACTIVE WASTE	DRY CLEANER REGISTRATION
TYPE OF OPERATION: convenience stores SMALL BUSINESS: X Yes 1 OTHER SIGNIFICANT MATTERS: To regarding this facility location. INTERESTED PARTIES: No one other the COMMENTS RECEIVED: The Texas Regional Contacts AND MAILING LIST: TCEQ Attorney: Ms. Stephanie For Ms. Lena Robert TCEQ Enforcement Coordinator: TCEQ Regional Contact: Ms. Nice Respondent: Mr. Sadruddin Noor Mr. Mr. Mr. Mr. Mr. Mr. Mr. Mr. Mr. Mr	No	d of additional pending enforcement actions terest in this matter. No comments were received. -3693 19 on, MC R-4, (817) 588-5933 2, (713) 767-3623 Park, Sugarland, Texas 77479

RESPONDENT NAME: SINDLO, INC. DBA RUBYS FOOD STORE DOCKET NO.: 2008-1825-PST-E

VIOLATION SUMMARY CHART:		
VIOLATION INFORMATION	PENALTY CONSIDERATIONS	CORRECTIVE ACTIONS TAKEN/REQUIRED
Type of Investigation:	Total Assessed: \$2,884	Corrective Actions Taken:
Complaint _X Routine Enforcement Follow-up Records Review	Total Deferred: \$0 Expedited Order Financial Inability to PaySEP Conditional Offset	The Executive Director recognizes that on October 28, 2008, the Respondent conducted the Stage II annual system compliance testing.
Date of Investigation Relating to this Case: October 28, 2008	Total Due to General Revenue: \$2,884	Ordering Provisions:
Date of NOE Relating to this Case: November 18, 2008 Background Facts:	This is a Default Order. The Respondent has not actually paid any of the assessed penalty but will be required to do so under the terms of this proposed Order.	The Respondent's UST delivery certificate is revoked immediately. The Respondent may submit an application for a new delivery certificate only after complying with all
Background Facts: The EDPRP was filed March 26, 2009, and mailed to the Respondent via certified mail, return receipt requested, and via first class mail, postage prepaid. According to the return receipt "green card," the Respondent received notice of the EDPRP on March 28, 2009, as evidenced by the signature on the card. The Respondent failed to file an answer, and a Default Order was set on the June 26, 2009, agenda. The Respondent filed an answer on June 17, 2009, and the matter was remanded to the Executive Director and referred to SOAH. On July 31, 2009, the TCEQ Chief Clerk mailed to the Respondent notice of	Site Compliance History Classification High X Average Poor	requirements of this Order. Within 10 days, the Respondent shall send its UST delivery certificate the TCEQ.
	Person Compliance History Classification High X Average Poor	
	Major Source: Yes X No Applicable Penalty Policy: September 2002	
the preliminary hearing scheduled for September 3, 2009, via certified mail, return receipt requested, and via first class mail, postage prepaid,. According to the return receipt "green card," on August 3, 2009, the Respondent received notice of the preliminary hearing. On September 3, 2009, the ALJ convened the preliminary hearing, but the Respondent failed to appear. The ED requested that the matter be remanded back to the ED and dismissed from the SOAH docket so that a Default Order may be entered.		
Current Compliance Status: The Respondent conducted the Stage II annual system compliance testing on October 28, 2008. The Respondent's delivery certificate expires in May 2010.		
PST: Failed to verify proper operation of the Stage II equipment at least once every 12 months [30 Tex. Admin. Code § 115.245(2) and Tex Health & Safety Code § 382.085(b)].		
		·

Penalty Calculation Worksheet (PCW) PCW Revision October 30, 2008 Policy Revision 2 (September 2002) Assigned 24-Nov-2008 PCW 27-Feb-2009 Screening 26-Nov-2008 **EPA Due** RESPONDENT/FACILITY INFORMATION Respondent SINDLO, INC. dba Rubys Food Store Reg. Ent. Ref. No. RN101872265 Major/Minor Source Minor Facility/Site Region 12-Houston CASE INFORMATION No. of Violations 1 Enf./Case ID No. 36849 Docket No. 2008-1825-PST-E Order Type 1660 Media Program(s) Petroleum Storage Tank Government/Non-Profit No Enf. Coordinator Mike Pace Multi-Media EC's Team Enforcement Team 6 Maximum \$10,000 Admin. Penalty \$ Limit Minimum Penalty Calculation Section \$2,500 TOTAL BASE PENALTY (Sum of violation base penalties) Subtotal 1 ADJUSTMENTS (+/-) TO SUBTOTAL 1 Subtotals 2-7 are obtained by multiplying the Total Base Penalty (Subtotal 1) by the indicated percentage Subtotals 2, 3, & 7 \$0 0.0% Enhancement Compliance History No adjustment due to compliance history. Notes Subtotal 4 \$0 0.0% Enhancement Culpability No The Respondent does not meet the culpability criteria. Notes \$0 Good Faith Effort to Comply Total Adjustments \$0 Subtotal 6 0.0% Enhancement* **Economic Benefit** *Capped at the Total EB \$ Amount Total FB Amounts \$384 Approx. Cost of Compliance \$2,500 SUM OF SUBTOTALS 1-7 Final Subtotal \$384 OTHER FACTORS AS JUSTICE MAY REQUIRE Adjustment

Recommended enhancement to capture the avoided cost of

compliance associated with the violation.

Deferral not offered for non-expedited settlement.

Reduces the Final Assessed Penalty by the indicted percentage. (Enter number only; e.g. 20 for 20% reduction.)

Final Penalty Amount

Final Assessed Penalty

Adiustment

\$2,884

\$2,884

\$2,884

\$0

Reduces or enhances the Final Subtotal by the indicated percentage.

Notes

Notes

PAYABLE PENALTY

STATUTORY LIMIT ADJUSTMENT

Caraar	ling Date 26-Nov-2008 Docket No. 2008-1825-PST-E			PCW
The state of the s	pondent SINDLO, INC. dba Rubys Food Store	Policy Pe	ा evision 2 (Septe	
\$1.50 ft 6 ft 8	se ID No. 36849	•	Revision Octob	
	ence No. RN101872265			, -
and the second of the second o	[Statute] Petroleum Storage Tank	•		
The first of the second of the second	ordinator Mike Pace			
(এক প্রকার বিভিন্ন বিজ্ -	er de la Contraction (Marchael Contraction			
lianco Histori	Compliance History Worksheet / Site Enhancement (Subtotal 2)			digerrouse Colores
Component	Number of	nter Number Here	Adjust.	ALLEDDAY D
NOVs	Written NOVs with same or similar violations as those in the current enforcement action (number of NOVs meeting criteria)	0	0%	
	Other written NOVs	0	0%	
	Any agreed final enforcement orders containing a denial of liability (number of orders meeting criteria)	0	0%	
Orders	Any adjudicated final enforcement orders, agreed final enforcement orders without a denial of liability, or default orders of this state or the federal government, or any final prohibitory emergency orders issued by the commission	0	0%	
Judgments	Any non-adjudicated final court judgments or consent decrees containing a denial of liability of this state or the federal government (number of judgements or consent decrees meeting criteria)	0	0%	
and Consent Decrees	Any adjudicated final court judgments and default judgments, or non-adjudicated final court judgments or consent decrees without a denial of liability, of this state or the federal government	O	0%	
Convictions	Any criminal convictions of this state or the federal government (number of counts)	0	0%	
Emissions	Chronic excessive emissions events (number of events)	0	0%	
Audits	Letters notifying the executive director of an intended audit conducted under the Texas Environmental, Health, and Safety Audit Privilege Act, 74th Legislature, 1995 (number of audits for which notices were submitted)	0	0%	
	Disclosures of violations under the Texas Environmental, Health, and Safety Audit Privilege Act, 74th Legislature, 1995 (number of audits for which violations were disclosed)	Ö	0%	
		se Enter Yes or No		
	Environmental management systems in place for one year or more	No	0%	
Other	Voluntary on-site compliance assessments conducted by the executive director under a special assistance program	No	0%	
	Participation in a voluntary pollution reduction program	No	0%	
	Early compliance with, or offer of a product that meets future state or federal government environmental requirements	No	0%	
	Adjustment P	ercentage (Su	btotal 2)	0%
ıt Violator (Sı				
No	A STATE OF THE STA	ercentage (Su	btotal 3)	0%
1.2.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1	y Person Classification (Subtotal 7)			
Average P		ercentage (Su	btotal 7)	0%
liance Histor	y Summary			
Compliance History Notes	No adjustment due to compliance history.			
.15105		(0-14-4-1-1		
	Total Adjustment Percentage	(Suprotais 2	, s, & /)	0%

Screening Date	26-Nov-2008	Docket No. 2008-18	325-PST-E	PCW
	SINDLO, INC. dba Rubys Food S	tore	•	evision 2 (September 2002)
Case ID No. Reg. Ent. Reference No.			POW	Revision October 30, 2008
	Petroleum Storage Tank			
Enf. Coordinator				-
Violation Number	1			1
Rule Cite(s)	30 Tex. Admin. Code § 115.	245(2) and Tex. Health & Safe	ty Code § 382.085(b)	
•				
Violation Description	Failed to verify proper operation of Specifically, the Stage II annual	of the Stage II equipment at least system compliance testing h	ast once every 12 months. ad not been conducted.	
·				
	·		Base Penalty	\$10,000
>> Environmental, Property an	d Human Health Matrix Harm			
Release	Major Moderate M	Minor		
OR Actual Potential	X	Percen	t 25%	
>>Programmatic Matrix	Major Moderate N	Vinor		· 's
Falsification	Major Moderate M	Percen	t 0%	
		The Name of the Control		
Matrix Human healtr Notes are p	or the environment will or could b rotective of human health or envir	e exposed to pollutants which onmental receptors as a result	of the violation.	
		Adjustm	ent \$7,500	1
	NEW METERS OF A PERSON OF THE PURIOR CONTROL OF THE			
				\$2,500
Violation Events				Population
Number of V	olation Events 1	365 Number	r of violation days	
	dally		•	
	weekly monthly			
mark only one with an x	quarterly semiannual		Violation Base Penalty	\$2,500
	annual X			
	The state of the s			1
One annual ev	ent is recommended for the 12-mo	onth period preceding the Octo	ber 28, 2008 investigation.	
Good Faith Efforts to Comply	0.0% Red			\$0
	Extraordinary Before NOV NOV	to EDPRP/Settlement Offer		
	Ordinary			
		with x)		
		came into compliance on Octo od Faith Reduction is offered w Order is recommended.		
			Violation Subtotal	\$2,500
Economic Benefit (EB) for this	violation	Statu	tory Limit Test	
Additional Action process in his basis on the second from the desired of the control of the cont	d EB Amount	maring global to the proposed to the first state of the first by the second of the sec	lation Final Penalty Total	\$2,884
	This	violation Final Assessed Per	nalty (adjusted for limits)	\$2,884

PUBLISHED REPORTED BY THE POST AND SECTION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PUBLISHED AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE PUBLISHED ADMINISTRATION OF THE PUBLISHED AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE PUBLISHED ADMINISTRATION OF THE PUBLISHED AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE PUBLISHED ADMINISTRATION OF THE PUBLISHED AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE PUBLISHED AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE PUBLISHED AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE PUBLISHED ADMINISTRATION OF	a Petroleum Stor	age Tank				Percent Interest	Years of Depreciation
Violation No						5.0	18
	Item Cost	Date Required	Final Date	Yrs	Interest Saved	Onetime Costs	EB Amount
Item Descriptio	n No commas or \$			Pel sala			
Delayed Cost	s 7 14 14 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15			<u> </u>			
Equipment				0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
Buildings				0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other (as needed)				0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
Engineering/construction				0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
Land				0.00	\$0	/atawin/ad/	\$0
Record Keeping System		As a second second		0.00	\$0	en la m/a la e/a	\$0
Training/Sampling				0.00	\$0	a#⊾ an/a . □ . □	\$0
Remediation/Disposal				0.00	\$0	in/a	\$0
Permit Costs	1.00	1		0.00	\$0	is a sum n/a sisk a l	\$0
		·					
Other (as needed)				0.00	\$0	n/a	\$0
Notes for DELAYED costs Avoided Cost: Disposal Personnel Inspection/Reporting/Sampling Supplies/equipment Financial Assurance [2]				entering 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	\$0 item (except for \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	one-time avoided c \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	\$0 osts) \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0
Notes for DELAYED costs Avoided Cost: Disposal Personnel Inspection/Reporting/Sampling Supplies/equipment	\$350	IUALIZE [1] avoid	ed costs before of	entering 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	\$0 item (except for \$0 \$0 \$0	one-time avoided c \$0 \$0 \$0	\$0 osts) \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0

Compliance History Report

Custome	er/Respondent/Owner-Operator:	CN601020258	SINDL	.O, INC.		Classification: AVERAGE	Rating: 3.0)1
Regulate	ed Entity:	RN101872265	Rubys	Food Store		Classification: AVERAGE BY DEFAULT	Site Rating	g: 3.01
ID Numi	per(s):	PETROLEUM ST		TANK	REGISTRA	TION	69987	or .
_ocation	: .	7500 ALMEDA R	D, HOUS	TON, TX, 77054		Rating Date: 9/1/2008 Repe	at Violator: NO)
TCEQ F	degion:	REGION 12 - HO	USTON					
Date Co	mpliance History Prepared:	November 24, 20	08					
Agency	Decision Requiring Compliance History:	Enforcement						
Complia	nce Period:	November 24, 20	03 to Nov					
TCEQ S	taff Member to Contact for Additional Info	rmation Regarding t	his Comp	oliance History				
Name:	Mike Pace	Ph	one:	817-588-5933				
		Site C	ompliar	nce History Comp	onents			
1. Has t	ne site been in existence and/or operation	for the full five year	compliar	nce period?	Yes			
	nere been a (known) change in ownership	of the site during th	e complia	ance period?	No			
	, who is the current owner?				N/A		•	
4. if Yes	s, who was/were the prior owner(s)?				N/A		•	
5. Whe	n did the change(s) in ownership occur?				N/A		_	
Comp	onents (Multimedia) for the Site :							
Α.	Final Enforcement Orders, court judger	ments, and consent	decrees	of the state of Texas	and the federal	government.		
	N/A							
В.	Any criminal convictions of the state of	Texas and the fede	ral goveri	nment.				
	N/A							
C.	Chronic excessive emissions events.							
	N/A							
D.	The approval dates of investigations. (0	CCEDS Inv. Track. I	No.)					
	1 11/18/2008 (70708	84)						
E.	Written notices of violations (NOV). (CO	CEDS Inv. Track No	n)					
⊏.	Willien Holices of Violations (NOV). (Or	JEDO IIIV. TIUGIK. TK	J.,					
	N/A							
F.	Environmental audits.							
G.	N/A Type of environmental management sy	rstems (FMSs)		٠.				
G.	N/A	atema (Livios).						
Н.	Voluntary on-site compliance assessment	ent dates.						
	N/A							
I.	Participation in a voluntary pollution rec	duction program.					,	
	N/A	• -					•	
J.	Early compliance.							
	N/A							
Sites O	utside of Texas							
	N/A			-				

TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY



IN THE MATTER OF AN	§	BEFORE THE
ENFORCEMENT ACTION	§	
CONCERNING	§	TEXAS COMMISSION ON
SINDLO, INC. DBA RUBYS FOOD	§	
STORE,	§	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
RN101872265	§	

DEFAULT ORDER DOCKET NO. 2008-1825-PST-E

At its	agenda, the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality,
("Commission" or "TCEQ") con	sidered the Executive Director's Preliminary Report and Petition
filed pursuant to TEX. WATER CO	DE chs. 7 and 26 and TEX. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE ch. 382 and the
rules of the TCEQ, which reques	ts appropriate relief, including the imposition of an administrative
penalty on the respondent and rev	ocation of the respondent's fuel delivery certificate. The respondent
	SINDLO, INC. dba Rubys Food Store ("SINDLO, INC.").

The Commission makes the following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law:

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. SINDLO, INC. owns and operates a convenience store with retail sales of gasoline located at 7500 Almeda Road, Houston, Harris County, Texas (the "Station").
- 2. SINDLO, INC.'s two (2) underground storage tanks ("USTs") are not exempt or excluded from regulation under the Texas Water Code or the rules of the Commission. SINDLO INC.'s USTs contain a regulated substance as defined in the rules of the Commission. The Station consists of one or more sources as defined in Tex. Health & Safety Code § 382.003(12).
- During an investigation October 28, 2008, a TCEQ Houston Local Program investigator documented that SINDLO, INC. failed to verify proper operation of the Stage II equipment at least once every twelve (12) months. Specifically, the Stage II annual system compliance testing had not been conducted.
- 4. SINDLO, INC. received notice of the violation on or about November 23, 2008.

- 5. The Executive Director recognizes that SINDLO, INC. conducted the Stage II annual system compliance testing on October 28, 2008.
- 6. The Executive Director filed the "Executive Director's Preliminary Report and Petition Recommending that the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality Enter an Enforcement Order Assessing an Administrative Penalty Against SINDLO, INC. dba Rubys Food Service" (the "EDPRP") in the TCEQ Chief Clerk's office on March 26, 2009.
- 7. By letter dated March 26, 2009, sent via certified mail, return receipt requested, and via first class mail, postage prepaid, the Executive Director served SINDLO, INC. with notice of the EDPRP. According to the return receipt "green card," SINDLO, INC. received notice of the EDPRP on March 28, 2009, as evidenced by the signature on the card.
- 8. SINDLO, INC. filed an answer requesting a hearing on June 17, 2009, and, pursuant to 30 Tex. Admin. Code § 70.109, the matter was referred to the State Office of Administrative Hearings ("SOAH") on July 21, 2009.
- 9. On July 31, 2009, the TCEQ Chief Clerk mailed the Notice of the September 3, 2009, preliminary hearing via certified mail, return receipt requested, and via first class mail, postage prepaid to SINDLO, INC. According to the return receipt "green card," SINDLO, INC. received notice of the September 3, 2009, preliminary hearing on August 3, 2009, as evidenced by the signature on the card.
- 10. On September 3, 2009, the Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") convened the preliminary hearing, but SINDLO, INC. failed to appear. The Executive Director requested that the matter be remanded to the Executive Director so that a Default Order may be entered and the case may be dismissed from the SOAH Docket.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. As evidenced by Finding of Fact Nos. 1 and 2, SINDLO, INC. is subject to the jurisdiction of the TCEQ pursuant to Tex. Water Code ch. 26 and Tex. Health & Safety Code ch. 382 and the rules of the Commission.
- 2. As evidenced by Finding of Fact No. 3, SINDLO, INC. failed to verify proper operation of the Stage II equipment at least once every twelve (12) months in violation of 30 Tex. ADMIN. CODE § 115.245(2) and Tex. Health & Safety Code § 382.085(b).

- 3. As evidenced by Finding of Fact Nos. 6 and 7, the Executive Director timely served SINDLO, INC. with proper notice of the EDPRP as required by Tex. WATER CODE § 7.055 and 30 Tex. Admin. Code § 70.104(a).
- 4. As evidenced by Finding of Fact No. 8, SINDLO, INC. filed an answer requesting a hearing as required by Tex. Water Code § 7.056 and 30 Tex. Admin. Code § 70.105, and the matter was referred to SOAH pursuant to 30 Tex. Admin. Code § 70.109.
- As evidenced by Finding of Fact No. 9, SINDLO, INC. was provided proper notice of the preliminary hearing pursuant to Tex. Gov't Code §§ 2001.051(1) and 2001.052, Tex. Water Code § 7.058 and 30 Tex. Admin. Code §§ 1.11, 1.12, 39.425, 70.104, and 80.6(b)(3).
- 6. As evidenced by Finding of Fact No. 10, SINDLO, INC. failed to appear for the preliminary hearing. Pursuant to Tex. Gov't Code § 2001.056, Tex. Water Code § 7.057, and 30 Tex. Admin. Code § 70.106(b), the Commission may enter a Default Order against SINDLO, INC. and assess the penalty recommended by the Executive Director.
- 7. Pursuant to Tex. Water Code § 7.051, the Commission has the authority to assess an administrative penalty against SINDLO, INC. for violations of the Texas Water Code and the Texas Health and Safety Code within the Commission's jurisdiction, for violations of rules adopted under such statutes, or for violations of orders or permits issued under such statutes.
- 8. An administrative penalty in the amount of two thousand eight hundred eighty four dollars (\$2,884.00) is justified by the facts recited in this Order, and considered in light of the factors set forth in Tex. Water Code § 7.053.
- 9. Tex. Water Code §§ 5.102 and 7.002 authorize the Commission to issue orders and make determinations necessary to effectuate the purposes of the statutes within its jurisdiction.
- 10. Pursuant to 30 Tex. ADMIN. CODE § 334.8(c)(6), the Commission has authority to revoke SINDLO, INC.'s UST delivery certificate if the Commission finds that good cause exists.
- Good cause for revocation of SINDLO, INC.'s UST delivery certificate exists as justified by Findings of Fact Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 6 through 10, and Conclusions of Law Nos. 2 through 6.

ORDERING PROVISIONS

NOW, THEREFORE, THE TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ORDERS that:

1. SINDLO, INC. is assessed an administrative penalty in the amount of two thousand eight hundred eighty four dollars (\$2,884.00) for violations of state statutes and TCEQ rules. The payment of this administrative penalty and SINDLO INC.'s compliance with all the terms and conditions set forth in this Order completely resolve the matters set forth by this Order in this action. The Commission shall not be constrained in any manner from requiring corrective actions or penalties for other violations that are not raised here. All checks submitted to pay the penalty imposed by this Order shall be made out to the "Texas Commission on Environmental Quality." The administrative penalty assessed by this Order shall be paid within thirty (30) days after the effective date of this Order and shall be sent with the notation "Re: SINDLO, INC. dba Rubys Food Store; Docket No. 2008-1825-PST-E" to:

Financial Administration Division, Revenues Section Attention: Cashier's Office, MC 214 Texas Commission on Environmental Quality P.O. Box 13088 Austin, Texas 78711-3088

- 2. SINDLO, INC.'s UST delivery certificate is revoked immediately upon the effective date of this Order. SINDLO, INC. may submit an application for a new delivery certificate only after SINDLO, INC. has complied with all of the requirements of this Order.
- 3. Within ten (10) days after the effective date of this Order, SINDLO, INC. shall send its UST delivery certificate to:

Order Compliance Team
Enforcement Division, MC 149A
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087

- 4. All relief not expressly granted in this Order is denied.
- 5. The provisions of this Order shall apply to and be binding upon SINDLO, INC. SINDLO, INC. is ordered to give notice of this Order to personnel who maintain day-to-day control over the Station operations referenced in this Order.

- 6. If SINDLO, INC. fails to comply with any of the Ordering Provisions in this Order within the prescribed schedules, and that failure is caused solely by an act of God, war, strike, riot, or other catastrophe, SINDLO, INC.'s failure to comply is not a violation of this Order. SINDLO, INC. shall have the burden of establishing to the Executive Director's satisfaction that such an event has occurred. SINDLO, INC. shall notify the Executive Director within seven days after SINDLO, INC. becomes aware of a delaying event and shall take all reasonable measures to mitigate and minimize any delay.
- 7. The Executive Director may grant an extension of any deadline in this Order or in any plan, report, or other document submitted pursuant to this Order, upon a written and substantiated showing of good cause. All requests for extensions by SINDLO, INC. shall be made in writing to the Executive Director. Extensions are not effective until SINDLO, INC. receives written approval from the Executive Director. The determination of what constitutes good cause rests solely with the Executive Director.
- 8. The Executive Director may refer this matter to the Office of the Attorney General of the State of Texas ("OAG") for further enforcement proceedings without notice to SINDLO, INC. if the Executive Director determines that SINDLO, INC. has not complied with one or more of the terms or conditions in this Order.
- 9. This Order shall terminate five years from its effective date or upon compliance with all the terms and conditions set forth in this Order, whichever is later.
- The Chief Clerk shall provide a copy of this Order to each of the parties. By law, the effective date of this Order shall be the date the Order is final, as provided by 30 Tex. ADMIN. CODE § 70.106(d) and Tex. Gov't Code § 2001.144.

SINDLO, INC. dba Rubys Food Store Docket No. 2008-1825-PST-E Page 6

SIGNATURE PAGE

TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

For the Commission

AFFIDAVIT OF STEPHANIE J. FRAZEE

STATE OF TEXAS COUNTY OF TRAVIS

"My name is Stephanie J. Frazee. I am of sound mind, capable of making this affidavit, and the facts stated in this affidavit are within my personal knowledge and are true and correct.

On behalf of the Executive Director of the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, I filed the "Executive Director's Preliminary Report and Petition Recommending that the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality Enter an Enforcement Order Assessing an Administrative Penalty Against SINDLO, INC. dba Rubys Food Store" (the "EDPRP") was filed with the Office of the Chief Clerk on March 26, 2009.

I sent the EDPRP to SINDLO, INC. at its last known address on March 26, 2009, via certified mail, return receipt requested, and via first class mail, postage prepaid. According to the return receipt "green card," SINDLO, INC. received notice of the EDPRP on March 28, 2009, as evidenced by the signature on the card.

SINDLO, INC. filed an answer requesting a hearing on June 17, 2009, and the matter was referred to the State Office of Administrative Hearings ("SOAH") on July 21, 2009.

Notice of the September 3, 2009, preliminary hearing was mailed to SINDLO, INC. by the TCEQ Chief Clerk on July 31, 2009. The Notice was sent to SINDLO, INC. via certified mail, return receipt requested, and via first class mail, postage prepaid. According to the return receipt "green card," SINDLO, INC. received the Notice of the Preliminary Hearing on August 3, 2009.

SINDLO, INC. failed to appear at the preliminary hearing on September 3, 2009. At that hearing, I requested and received a finding that SINDLO, INC. was served with proper notice of the hearing. I also requested and received a remand from the Administrative Law Judge pursuant to 1 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 155.501(e)(1), which gives an ALJ the authority to remand the case back to the agency "to allow the agency to dispose of the case on a default basis under TEX. GOV'T CODE § 2001.056 and the referring agency's rules." Pursuant to TEX. GOV'T CODE § 2001.056, TEX. WATER CODE § 7.057, and 30 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 70.106(b), the Commission may enter a Default Order against SINDLO, INC. and assess the penalty recommended by the Executive Director."

Stephanie J. Fra

Attorney

Texas Commission on Environmental Quality

Before me, the undersigned authority, on this day personally appeared Stephanie J. Frazee, known to me to be the person whose name is subscribed to the foregoing instrument and acknowledged to me that she executed the same for the purposes and consideration herein expressed.

Given under my hand and seal of office this 18th day of Supt, A.D., 2009.

Stamp Cheryl Arredondo Notary Signature

Notary Stam

Notary Public State of Texas by Commission Expires August 11, 2013